



22

PATENT
Attorney Docket No. 4739.0080-00

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| | | |
|-----------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| In re Application of: |) | |
| |) | |
| Junichi NISHIDA |) | Group Art Unit: 3661 |
| |) | |
| Application No.: 10/777,141 |) | Examiner: Cuong H. Nguyen |
| |) | |
| Filed: February 13, 2004 |) | |
| |) | |
| For: MOBILE OBJECT POSITION |) | Confirmation No.: 3793 |
| DETECTING APPARATUS AND |) | |
| METHOD |) | |

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

REPLY TO OFFICE ACTION

In reply to the Office Action mailed April 16, 2007, Applicant submits the following response.

Amendments to the Claims are reflected in the listing of claims in this paper.

Remarks/Arguments follow the amendment sections of this paper.

RESTRICTION

The Examiner required restriction under 35 U.S.C. § 121 between the following inventions:

Group I: claims 1-5, and 11-13 directed to an apparatus or a system;

Group II: claims 6-10 directed to a method comprising steps hat detect a position of an object using position information.

Applicant elects Group I, claims 1-5, and 11-13.

The Office Action at page 3, contains language related to a species election. The species election requirement is unclear, because the Examiner does not clearly delineate the different species; but it appears that the Examiner considers Groups I and II to also be separate species. As well as the species election requirement can be understood, Applicant elects Group I. Claims 1-5, and 11-13, read on this species. Applicant asserts that claim 1 is generic to both species. If the Examiner intended some other division of species, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned counsel and clarify the Office Action.